HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P. (S) NO. 2317 OF 2005

Petitioner : Bharat Lal Chandravanshi, aged about 35 years, Son of Shri Hikhiram Chandravanshi, Resident of Village Khapri, Post-Chachedi, Tahsil-Kawardha, Distt.- Rajnandgaon.

Versus

Respondents :1. State of M.P.
Through Secretary, School Education Department, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)

2. The Commissioner,
Public instructions, Government of Madhya Pradesh, Bhiopal (M.P.).

3. The Director
Public Instructions,
School Education Department,
Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.).

4. The Joint Director,
Public Instructions,
Bilaspur Division, Bilaspur,
Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.).

Present: Shri Vinay Pandey, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri Pankaj Shrivastava, Panel lawyer for the respondents/State.

ORAL ORDER

(10th January, 2006)

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner was employed on ad-hoc basis as Upper Division Teacher by the respondents and posted at Government Higher Secondary School, Fosterpur, Tahsil-Mungeli, District-Bilaspur.
2. Vide order dated 30.4.1983 (Annexure A-4) passed by the Principal, Government Higher Secondary School, Fosterpur Tahsil-Mungeli, District-Bilaspur, service of the petitioner came to an end on the ground that the petitioner was appointed on ad-hoc basis and his service was not required and as such the service was discontinued w.e.f. 30.4.1983.
3. The petitioner has filed this petition before the State Administrative Tribunal, Bench at Raipur on 28.10.1997 praying that the respondents be directed to re-examine the case of the petitioner and reinstate on the post of Upper Division Teacher, subject to availability of the vacancy and further subject to suitability of the petitioner for appointment on the post of Upper Division Teacher.
4. The petitioner was appointed on ad-hoc basis for a certain period and service of the petitioner was dispensed with as no longer required, as such the petitioner has no right to continue on the post of Upper Division Teacher. However, at this stage, it is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner may be granted liberty to move the authorities by way of representation and respondents be

directed to consider the same, in accordance with law, to which learned counsel for the respondents have no objection.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is granted liberty to make a representation, if so advised. If such representation is made, the respondents are directed to consider and decide the same, in accordance with law, as early as possible.

6. In view of the foregoing, the petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Bablu